APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,577	09/29/2003	Sathyanarayana Nagendra Puttu	50325-0797	5403

29989   7590   12/17/2009
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/674,577	PUTTU ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		CHARLES E. ANYA	2194	
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --				

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *9/22/09*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *16-22,38-44,60-66 and 82-88* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *16-22,38-44,60-66 and 82-88* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 16-22, 38-44, 60-66 and 82-88 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

3.   Claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 82, 84, 85, 87

and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub.

No. 2003/0131096 A1 to Goringe et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,664,978 B1 issued

to Kekic et al.

4.   As to claim 16, Goringe teaches a method for verifying information on a managed

device, comprising:

        a computer system comprising a managed device performing:

        receiving, from a requester ("...user..." Abstract) that stores an incorrect

attribute value for an SNMP MIB object (Credential Repository 108) and is unable to

read and write the SNMP object directly, and unable to obtain MIB object specification

information, and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object, a request
identifying an SNMP MIB object and also containing one or more non-null values
comprising proposals for a correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…user provides
invalid…credentials…" Abstract, Step 248 page 3 paragraph 0040), wherein the request
requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values matches the
correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object of the managed device:

determining whether any of the one or more values matches the correct value
stored in the SNMP MIB object ("…credential discovery agent…testing the validity…"
page 1 paragraphs 0008-0013).

Goringe is silent with reference to a SNMP GET request identifying an SNMP MIB
object and also containing plurality of non-null values comprising proposals for a correct
value of the SNMP MIB object, wherein the SNMP GET request requests a
determination as to whether any of the values match the correct value stored in the
SNMP MIB object of the managed device, and

completing execution of the request by:

transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the values matches
the correct value of the SNMP MIB object and without providing the correct value in
response to the SNMP GET request.

Kekic teaches a SNMP GET request identifying an SNMP MIB object and also
containing plurality of non-null values comprising proposals for a correct value of the
SNMP MIB object ("…snmpGet ()…" Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46), wherein the SNMP GET
request requests a determination as to whether any of the values match the correct

value stored in the SNMP MIB object of the managed device ("…Valid

parameters…otherwise…" Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46), and

completing execution of the request by:

transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the values matches

the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…error message…" Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46)

and without providing the correct value in response to the SNMP GET request ("…error

message…is given instead of the valid MIB value…" Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Goringe with the teaching of Kekic because

the teaching of Kekic would improve the system of Goringe by providing an object that a

domain uses to collect information about a particular processing and informing another

domain of the success or failure of the particular processing.

5.   As to claim 18, Goringe teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the obtain MIB

object specification information for the SNMP MIB object is not generally available

("…user provides invalid…credentials…" Abstract, Step 248 page 3 paragraph 0040).

6.   As to claim 19, Goringe teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the SNMP MIB

object stores an attribute for a user credential for a protocol other than SNMP

("...TELNET..." page 4 paragraph 0049).

7.   As to claim 21, Kekic teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the determining

step results in determining that none of the values matches the correct value of the

SNMP MIB object, and the transmitting step completing execution of the request

comprises the transmitting a notification message includes an error message that

describes an encountered problem in determining whether the values matches the

correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("...error message..." Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46).

8.   As to claim 22, Kekic teaches the method as recited in Claim 16, wherein the

transmittal step comprises the step of storing, in a specified MIB object of the managed

device, a notification value indicating whether any of the one or more values match the

correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("...error message..." Col. 86 Ln. 25 – 46).

9.   As to claims 38, 60 and 82, see the rejection of claim 16 above.

10.   As to claims 40, 62 and 84, see the rejection of claim 18 above.

11.   As to claims 41, 63 and 85, see the rejection of claim 19 above.

12.   As to claims 43, 65 and 87, see the rejection of claim 21 above.

13.   As to claims 44, 66 and 88, see the rejection of claim 22 above.

14.   **Claims 17, 39, 61 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0131096 A1 to Goringe et al. in view of U.S.

Pat. No. 6,664,978 B1 issued to Kekic et al. as applied to claims 16 and 38 and 60

and 82 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0032761 A1 to Aoyagi et

al.

15.   As to claim 17, Kekic and Goringe are silent with reference to the method of

Claim 16, wherein the notification message identifies, using an index position and not

the correct value, which one of the values matches the correct value stored in the

SNMP MIB object.

        Aoyagi teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the notification message

identifies, using an index position and not the correct value, which one of the values

matches the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object ("…Get-

Response…messages have a PDU configuration...the PDU field consists of...Error

Status 206..., Error Index 207 for storing the point of occurrence of an error..." page 8

paragraph 0168).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Kekic and Goringe with the teaching of

Aoyagi because the teaching of Aoyagi would improve the system of Kekic and Goringe

by enabling rapid identification of point of occurrence of an error (Aoyagi page 8

paragraph 0168).

16.   As to claims 39, 61 and 83, see the rejection of claim 17 above.

17.   Claims 20, 42, 64 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0131096 A1 to Goringe et al. in view of U.S.

Pat. No. 6,664,978 B1 issued to Kekic et al. as applied to claims 16 and 38 and 60

and 82 above, and further in view of WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices

Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan.

18.   As to claim 20, Kekic and Goringe are silent with reference to the method of

Claim 16, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one

member of the following group consisting of: a telnet protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP

protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS

protocol.

        Kwan teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a

username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet

protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a

TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol (pages 16, 23, 27, 28, 31, 34, 36, 37, 41, 44,

45, 50, 53).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Kekic and Goringe with the teaching of

Kwan because the teaching of Kwan would improve the system of Kekic and Goringe by

providing basic access security so as to protect devices against unauthorized access
and usage (Kwan page 14).

19.   As to claims 42, 64 and 86, see the rejection of claim 20 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/09 have been fully considered but they are not
persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that (1) the Goringe prior art does not teach the
process of validating a request, (2) the Kekic prior art does not teach a SNMP get
request that include plural proposed values to be matched against the actual MIB
variable value, and (3) the "error message" of Kekic prior art is not functionally
equivalent to the claimed notification message.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

As to point (1), the Goringe prior art discloses a system and method for
determining one or more credentials of a network device. The system comprises a
credential repository and a credential discovery agent configured to determine one or
more valid credentials for selected network devices. The credential repository holds
credentials that have been learned (e.g., from the user, by a successful guess, etc.).
The credential repository is used to save the credentials between executions and can
have things removed or added to it during agent operation. The credential discovery
agent determines one or more credentials of a network device by performing the steps

of: selecting a first network device from among a plurality of network devices,

accessing the credential repository, the credential repository comprising a first set of

credentials corresponding to the first network device, contacting the first network device,

and testing the validity of the first set of credentials.

These steps are validation process contrary to Applicant's argument.

As to point (2), the Kekic prior art discloses a Snmp Get request (e.g. snmpGet

()) that includes valid **parameter(s)** (e.g. device name, a community string and a MIB

variable). The Snmp Get request that includes valid parameter(s) is functionally

equivalent to the claimed "plurality of non-null values" because the Snmp Get request

has plural values and is tested against the values in a MIB values.

As to point (3), the claimed "notification message" is a reply or response returned

after a determination of whether a matching value is found in an MIB. The "error

message" of the Kekic prior art is functionally equivalent to the claimed "notification

message" because it is also a reply or response returned after a determination of

whether a matching value is found in an MIB.

Secondly and most importantly, this application on page 12 paragraph 0037

discloses that the claimed "notification message may include an error message".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CHARLES E. ANYA whose telephone number is

(571)272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                              /Charles E Anya/
                              Examiner, Art Unit 2194